

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 43 and 64 have been amended. Claims 1-42, 44-45, 50, 61-62, 65-66, 71 and 82-83 have been canceled. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added.

### Claim Rejections

Independent claims 43, 52, 57, 64, 73, and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Reed et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,004,205), in view of Frietas et al. (U.S. 2002/0,049,858). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

One of the basic requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

MPEP §2143.

Claim 43 recites:

43. A method for operating an electronic mail server system having mailboxes associated with wireless client devices, the method comprising:  
    **receiving input to change an organizational structure of a mailbox;**  
    making a change to the organizational structure of the mailbox in response to the input; and  
    pushing a message to a wireless client device associated with the mailbox, the message comprising information about the organizational change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the wireless client device to **synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the wireless client device with the mailbox prior to notifying a user of the change to the mailbox.**  
(Emphasis added).

By contrast, Reed and Frietas, individually or in combination, do not teach the above emphasized claim limitations. Reed discloses an automated communications system operating to transfer data, metadata and methods from a provider computer to a consumer computer through a

communication network. In addition, information which changes in the provider computer is automatically updated in the consumer computer through the communications system.

Reed does not teach or suggest receiving input to change an organizational structure of a mailbox. The Examiner cites Reed's column 5 lines 5-17, column 29 lines 36-38, column 43 lines 29-40, 44-47 and column 44 lines 14-17, alleging these sections teach this claim limitation. These cited sections, however, contain no disclosure or even a hint regarding receiving input to change an organizational structure of a mailbox. Specifically, column 5 lines 5-17 discuss notifying users of any new data entry in a database via e-mail. Column 29 lines 36-38 discuss a directory to communication objects in a consumer database. Column 43 lines 29-40 and lines 44-47 discuss metadata describing a control structure. None of the above cited sections teach or suggest receiving input to change an organizational structure of a mailbox.

Since Reed does not teach or suggest receiving input to change an organizational structure of a mailbox, it also does not teach or suggest making a change to the organizational structure of the mailbox in response to the input, which is also recited in claim 43.

As explained in the response to the Office Action mailed on 3/11/2005, Reed also fails to disclose pushing a message to a client device, the message comprising information used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of a mailbox with a mailbox stored on a server prior to notifying a user of the change to the mailbox.

Although Reed describes synchronization of copies of a forum, Reed fails to disclose synchronizing a cached version of a mailbox with a mailbox on the server. A forum, as described by Reed, is a shared database covering related interest topics. As such, a forum is not a mailbox, as is claimed by Applicant. Additionally, Reed discloses synchronizing a communications relationship, but fails to show a wireless client device to synchronize mailboxes.

Frietas does not teach or suggest the above discussed claim limitations, either. Neither does the Examiner contend so.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, the Examiner fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103(a). Claim 43 is not obvious based on Reed in view of Frietas. Independent claims 52, 57, 64, 73, and 78 recite limitations similar to those in claim 43. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over Reed and Frietas for similar reasons.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

3/20/06

  
Jordan M. Becker  
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300